



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,330	03/22/2004	Ming-Yuh Yeh	BHT-3111-439	9073

7590 03/31/2008  
BRUCE H. TROXELL  
SUITE 1404  
5205 LEESBURG PIKE  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041

EXAMINER
----------

DAHBOUR, HENRY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/31/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/805,330	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YEH ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> HENRY DAHBOUR	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/28/05</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and / or use the invention. In particular, claims 1, 12, 14, 15 & 18 each recite the term "functional block". However, applicant's specification does not contain an adequate explanation of what this term means. Furthermore, in applicant's specification, the appearances of term "functional block" are not followed by any element numbers with corresponding element numbers in the Figures. Appropriate corrections are required.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "functional block" recited in claims 1, 12, 14, 15 & 18 must be shown, with corresponding element number(s) or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate

prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3-5, 7-18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blitz et al (U.S.5170267) in view of Rinaldi et al (U.S.6327002).

Regarding claim 1, Blitz discloses a multifunction peripheral comprising a controller (see 7 in Figure 2), and a display (see 62 in Figure 1).

Blitz does not disclose a video encoder and a video output interface.

Rinaldi discloses these features (see 22, 30, 32 in Figure 1).

Blitz and Rinaldi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is the art of imaging devices.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the video encoder and the video output interface of Rinaldi et al in between the controller and display of Blitz.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so is because Rinaldi et al teaches that the video encoder and video output interface are located between a controller and a display (see "controller" in Figure 1, also see 22, 30, 32 in Figure 1, also see "composite video output port and an S-video output port which allow video signals to be sourced to a television" in lines 28-30 in column 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Blitz with Rinaldi to obtain the invention specified in claim(s) 1.

Regarding claim 3, Rinaldi et al discloses the video output interface being a wire interface (see 30, 32 in Figure 1).

Regarding claim 4, Rinaldi et al discloses the video format being a NTSC format (see "video format...NTSC" in lines 35-36 in column 6).

Regarding claim 5, Rinaldi et al discloses the video format being a PAL format (see "video format...PAL" in lines 35-36 in column 6).

Regarding claim 7, Rinaldi et al discloses the video output interface being a TV-OUT (see 30, 32 in Figure 1), and Blitz discloses the display unit being a television (see 62 in Figure 1).

Regarding claims 8-11, Blitz discloses an input interface (see 52 in Figure 2) coupled to an input unit for receiving a command from the input unit (64, 66 in Fig.1), wherein the input unit is a mouse (66), wherein the input unit is a keyboard (64). Furthermore, regarding claim 11, since some keyboards and mice are USB-keyboards and USB-mice, it would have been obvious for the input interface to be a USB interface.

Regarding claims 12 & 13, see rejection of claims 1 & 8.

Regarding claim 14, Blitz discloses an image scanning module (see 6 in Figure 2).

Regarding claim 15, Blitz discloses a printing module (see 8 in Figure 2).

Regarding claim 16, see rejection of claim 10.

Regarding claim 17, see rejection of claim 9.

Regarding claim 18, see rejection of claims 1 & 15.

Regarding claim 20, see rejection of claim 3.

6. Claims 2, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blitz et al (U.S.5170267) in view of Rinaldi et al (U.S.6327002) and WenHsiang (U.S.6753852).

Regarding claim 2, Blitz & Rinaldi do not disclose a wireless communication interface.

WenHsiang discloses this feature (see Figures 4, 5, 6).

Blitz, Rinaldi and WenHsiang are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is the art of imaging devices.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of WenHsiang with the device of Blitz and Rinaldi.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so is because WenHsiang teaches that it would allow for a monitor to be mobile (see “the monitor...become...mobile” in lines 31-32 in col.1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Blitz & Rinaldi with WenHsiang to obtain the invention specified in claim(s) 2.

Regarding claim 19, see rejection of claim 2.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blitz et al (U.S.5170267) in view of Rinaldi et al (U.S.6327002) and Kwon et al (U.S.7043691).

Regarding claim 6, Blitz and Rinaldi do not disclose a VGA format.

Kwon discloses this feature (see "VGA" in line 28 in column 3).

Blitz, Rinaldi and Kwon are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, that is the art of imaging devices.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the feature of Kwon with the device of Blitz and Rinaldi.

The suggestion/motivation for doing is because Kwon teaches that some televisions can receive the VGA format (see "TV receiver may be connected to...VGA" in lines 21 & 28 in column 3).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Blitz & Rinaldi with Kwon to obtain the invention specified in claim(s) 6.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Smith et al ('089), Smith et al ('377), Hill Jr. et al, Nanamura et al, Shibasaki et al, Leo et al, Gotham et al and Ruppert are cited to show MFP/copiers.

Art Unit: 2625

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HENRY DAHBOUR whose telephone number is (571)272-4295. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00AM-5:30PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on 571-272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HD

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625